

III. REMARKS

The independent claims 1 and 16 of the present application recite that a mobile station or terminal transmits a message comprising location information to the system and where a management system starts controlling the terminal on the basis of the message. Both of these features are missing in the combined teaching of Tiedemann and Chatterjee. The advantage of these features are simplified logistics, faster and easier installation, reduction in errors, and installation regardless of whether the management system is manned or not.

As already noted in the previous responses, and as the Examiner admits, Tiedemann does not disclose transmitting location features at all.

Chatterjee teaches an automatic activation method of a mobile station in a wireless network. In Chatterjee, when a mobile station is turned on for the first time, the mobile station sends information (a registration order) to the network. However, the registration order does not comprise any information about the location of the mobile unit. The order comprises information about the identity of the mobile station (for example MIN, Mobile identity number). The base station receives the information and transmits the information to the MSC. On the basis of the information, the MSC detects the identity of the mobile station and on the basis of the base station which sent the information to the MSC, the location of the mobile station is determined, but the accuracy is the service area of the base station. Finally, the MSC registers the mobile into the network.

The independent claims 1 and 16 of the application state that the terminal sends location information to the network and that the network determines the location of the terminal unit on the basis

of the information sent by the terminal unit. Both of these steps are missing from Chatterjee and Tiedemann as are the advantages described above.

It is also noted that there is no suggestion to combine the two references as required by Ex parte Jones, 62 USPQ2d 1206, 1208, and Ex parte Metcalf 67 USPQ2d 1633, 1635.

Therefore the rejection of claims 1-7, 9, 16 and 18 under 35 USC 103 on these references should be withdrawn.

Also, Lee fails to disclose the claimed features. Thus the rejection of claim 10 under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn since combining Lee with Tiedemann and Chatterjee does not result in the present invention.

Further, Sarpola also fails to disclose the above recited features. Thus the rejection of claims 11-15 and 19-22 under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn since combining Sarpola with Tiedemann and Chatterjee does not result in the present invention.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry I. Steckler
Henry I. Steckler
Reg. No. 24,139

Sept 24, 2003
Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800
Customer No.: 2512

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 9/24/03

Signature: Guadalupe Rodriguez
Person Making Deposit